THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1942. Vol. XXXI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Christianity in the Third Year of the War.

Our nation has kept with an increasing sense of bereavement, but also with increasing inflexibility of purpose, the third Christmas of the war, a war in which now all the great Christian and non-Christian Powers of the world are involved. With the reiteration of the Christmas message of peace and goodwill, not a few are tempted to ask: Has Christianity nothing better than this to shew for its two thousand years of existence? Such a question seems to presuppose that the Christian religion is so perfectly attuned to human nature that nothing more is needed than to proclaim it truly, and that, as a consequence, it will be gladly received and loyally practised. Such a conclusion is absurd in the light of what modern biology and psychology teach us about human nature. We are all of us evolutionists to-day and are compelled to accept as true the statement of the man who described himself as a walking menagerie: the ape and the tiger are there, and, what troubled Bishop Creighton most of all, 'the primitive donkey.'

The Christian Gospel may be—and is, we believe—perfectly attuned to the needs of human nature, but that is not the brute nature in man. Tertullian was undoubtedly right when he described the *anima humana* as *naturaliter christiana*. It is the higher nature in man—'the white horse,' to use Plato's meta-

phor, not 'the black horse'—which is attracted upward by the Gospel of Christ. But that human nature cannot obey the Gospel perfectly until it has subjugated or transformed the brute nature, and this act of subjugation is not something that needs to be done only once and forever. It demands endless repetition at every stage of personal experience and of human history. Hence the slowness of the extension of Christian influence in the world and the slowness of the Ascent of Man. That is at least half the answer to those who complain that after two thousand years Christianity ought to have something better to show than the horrors of the present world-wide war.

The other half of the answer is equally obvious. The present war is being fought by the Allied Powers on behalf of justice, freedom, human civilization and world progress against a barbarian and cruel tyranny, ruthlessly exercised over weaker communities. Never was any war in this world fought on behalf of a better cause; and so far as the British Empire is concerned, we believe that it would never have been fought at all if it had not been that that Empire is fundamentally Christian in its spirit. The late Archbishop of Melbourne, whose obituary appeared in the *Times* of December 19, used to say:

> 'The Empire was part of his religion, because he believed that God had called its people and had been training them to undertake the Christianizing of the world.'

Not one of the least exacting tasks in this Christianizing of the world is the heroic self-sacrifice freely offered by so many of our fellow-citizens in this present war.

No doubt there are many defects in our national life to-day: there are unworthy citizens who are simply using war conditions to further their own selfish desires and personal ambitions: men who are prepared to hold their country, and even the cause of humanity, up to ransom in order that they may secure advantage for themselves and their circle. But they are the minority. The spirit of the Empire is sound and there are many indications of this. With what deep satisfaction was the King's address to the Empire listened to on Christmas afternoon, and how profoundly Christian that address was. 'He is a Priest-King,' was the involuntary utterance of a listener at its close. We cannot fail to note a deepening sense of the need of God's guidance and

blessing on our endeavours manifesting itself in the speeches of our greatest leaders, and none the less real because marked by restraint and a sense of humour.

This Christian influence is manifesting itself in various ways in our public life, whether it be the custom adopted by the Parliament of New Zealand of observing the 'silent minute' when Big Ben is heard in their House, or in the opening of the monthly proceedings of the Rural District Council of Repton with a fifteen-minute religious service (*Times*, January 3). On the other hand, the Christian Church and those officially responsible for the extension of the influence of the Christian Religion among mankind, have no justification for complacency at the present time. There is a growing sense of the need of religion in human life, particularly in the life of the community and of the nation, and even of mankind as a whole. It is becoming increasingly clear to many that that religion can only be the Christian religion. But here the crux appears, and the need for courageous, clear-minded and great-hearted leadership is urgently demanded. But is that leadership forthcoming?

We have referred to the great enemy with which the Christian religion is confronted in the brute nature from which humanity has been evolved. This, it will be maintained, is Christianity's greatest enemy. But Christianity has another enemy hardly less powerful, and that because so often successfully camouflaged—the Christian Church itself. The Christian Church, which came into existence to promote the Christian Religion, has again and again proved itself to be that religion's greatest enemy, not so much by yielding to 'the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye and the pride of life,' as by attempting to propagate 'a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge,' and by the failure to differentiate between the essentials and non-essentials of Christianity, so neglecting the principle of putting first things first in the presentation of that religion to mankind. How can the responsible leaders of the Church to-day, who propose to make the Christian Religion the spiritual home of humanity, dare to include in their valuation of the Christian Religion the multitude of non-essentials which divide their forces and render ineffective their efforts in Christian lands to-day? When will they have the courage and the greatness of vision to sweep all these

things aside, and concentrate alone on those Christian values which can save mankind and which mankind is increasingly realizing are the values which it needs for world justice, world peace, world freedom and world development? The Christian values consist of spiritual relations, ethical ideals, moral standards. These are the essentials of the Christian Religion; not ecclesiastical organizations, sacramental rites, dogmatic formularies. Until the Church's leaders recognize this and publicly confess it, and consistently act upon it, the Christian Religion cannot become the uplifting and unifying religion of mankind.

The Demand of the Headmasters for a Definition of Christian Faith.

At the recent annual meeting of the Headmasters' Conference at Oxford, reported in the *Times* of Jan. 3, the following resolution was carried by sixty-two votes to two :

> 'That the Headmasters' Conference, reaffirming their resolution of 1940 and pledging themselves to their resolve to make the Christian Faith the basis and inspiration of their work, appeal to the leaders of the Christian Churches in this country to find means of preparing a joint statement of our common Christian Faith which could be employed as a basis for the teaching in the schools.'

This is one of those impressive indications that our British civilization is essentially Christian. The Headmasters of our Public Schools are resolved 'to make the Christian Faith the basis and inspiration of their work,' and then, not less typical of good Christian laymen in this Christian land, they modestly appeal to the Heads of the various ecclesiastical denominations in this country to define their Christian faith for them. What do they hope to secure by such an appeal? Are they not satisfied with the definition of the Christian Faith as set forth in the Apostles' Creed? We opine that they are not, neither are we, yet the Authorities of the Church of England are, and the Church of England is still by far the most influential Christian denomination in this country. Any attempt to provide a new authoritative definition of the Christian Faith at this time is a task of such extreme difficulty that we doubt if any representative body of English ecclesiastics will dare to attempt it. They are bound, we feel, to fall back upon some traditional formulary and to offer that to the headmasters. No doubt Modern Church-

men would be happy to oblige, but our headmasters would hardly be prepared to accept their definition as representative of the mind of the united Christian front in this country.

We have much sympathy with the eighteenth century English bishop—a Latitudinarian, we have to confess—who when he was asked what was the Christian Faith, replied: 'I should prefer to tell you, not what it is, but where it can be found. It is to be found here,' said he, laying his hand on the Bible. We believe it was the Bible, but we think it would have been better had the bishop restricted himself to the New Testament. It seems to us that every Christian master has, in this undertaking, to make the New Testament his handbook for teaching the Christian religion. Assisted by humble reliance on the guidance of the divine Spirit and the use of modern methods of critical and historical study, he should be able to secure all that he needs for his pupils and himself. There is no royal road to learning even in the sphere of the Christian religion, except it be that royal road which Christ both taught and trod. If teachers and scholars could school themselves to ask themselves first and foremost, not 'What is the Church's Faith about Jesus Christ?' but 'What was the Faith of Jesus Christ himself?' they would be making the right beginning. In other words, they would be trying to start enquiry and study where the Christian religion itself originated. In an age which believes in evolution and development it would be wrong to suppose that the whole answer as to what is the Christian Faith could be contained in the answer to the question, 'What was the Faith of Jesus Christ himself?' Yet, undoubtedly, the most essential and indispensable contribution to the complete answer would be contained in the right answer to that fundamental question.

It is needful to add that the *faith* of Jesus Christ is a more profound and fundamental thing from the *beliefs* of Jesus Christ. In the light of our modern knowledge it has to be said, and quite plainly, that certain beliefs of Jesus Christ—for example about the origin, authorship, historical character of many of the Old Testament writings—merely reflected the views of contemporary Judaism and are contradicted by modern Biblical research. So also our Lord's beliefs in the relation of demons to disease—if these were indeed his beliefs—must be

regarded as erroneous in the light of modern medical science. Other examples might be given, but there is no need to do so here. These out-of-date beliefs should not be identified with the faith of Jesus Christ, which, as we have said, is much more profound and fundamental and upon the acceptance of which our Christian Faith itself rests.

That faith of Jesus Christ is concerned with his faith in the Divine Father, in the coming Kingdom of God, in himself, his mission and gospel; his faith in human nature, in prayer, in forgiveness, and in the future life. It is the mistaken identification of the *beliefs* of Jesus Christ with the *faith* of Jesus Christ, prevailing at the present time in Christian circles, which makes the simple appeal of the headmasters such an extremely difficult one to satisfy. We venture to think, therefore, that the headmasters would do better to be satisfied with the first half of their resolution, 'pledging themselves to their resolve to make the Christian Faith the basis and inspiration of their work,' and to leave the definition of it to be solved by each teacher, as by each scholar, as the outcome of his own religious studies and moral and spiritual endeavours. The true definition of Christian Faith can only be secured, not at the beginning, but at the end of the curriculum; for in accordance with the well-known axiom of Aristotle, 'The true nature of a thing is that which it is when its becoming is completed.' The Christian Faith has a long way to travel, and many enlarging and illuminating experiences to undergo, before the end is reached.

Practical Liturgical Reform by a C.F.

Once again, as during the Great War, earnest and intelligent parochial clergymen who have become Chaplains to the Forces are enlarging their experience of the religious needs of the male half of the nation and how best to meet them. In our December issue we published a valuable statement by an R.A.F. chaplain on the religious education of young men: we now publish a letter dealing with some practical attempts at liturgical reform by another Army chaplain.

Sir,

May I make a few comments upon Liturgical Reform, a subject of perennial and practical concern to the M.C.U.

I find that I am continually making more and more use of our Prayer Book collects—said *collectively*. In these days when everyone can read there is no reason why the minister alone should offer up the prayers, and I find that the men greatly enjoy saying the second and third collects at Mattins and Evensong, the prayer for all sorts and conditions of men, the General Thanksgiving, and other such prayers.

I also frequently take, in the barracks and at the hospital, the ante-Communion service with the Ten Commandments in full. I let the men say with me all the opening prayers and the prayer for the King. They respond well. Much of the teaching of the Ten Commandments seems to have a quite delightful spice of novelty, so that I feel that it is not used amiss! Prayers, however beautiful, said by the padré alone soon cease to grip the attention of the men.

We have lots of hymns, and oh! that we had better words to the old tunes; the Psalms are always said not antiphonally, but altogether, in clear, slow diction, which thank God I can command; and much thought and time are spent in preparing the service. After all, consider how an actor rehearses his public performance, which he cannot begin to act until he is word perfect; no more can we. God's Spirit cannot use us if we are still, like an unpractised musician, fumbling to get the notes right.

We appreciate every point made by the writer of this letter except his recitation of the Decalogue in full. Such a public pronouncement as, 'For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it,' may excite comment but is hardly likely to produce conviction. The statement also, 'I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, and visit the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me,' if taken in its literal sense by half-educated hearers, tends either to arouse indignant protest or to promote a wrong conception of the Divine nature. We believe that the use of the Decalogue, not only in the ante-Communion Service but on other occasions, to be a wholesome procedure in view of the falling moral standards of large classes of our community, but we favour the public use of the Decalogue in the brief form of the original 'Ten Words.' Those who are interested to learn what that original form was can find it in the Warburton Lectures delivered by Archdeacon R. H. Charles to the lawyers of Lincoln's Inn.

How great is the need for such plain, direct and authoritative moral teaching as we have in the Decalogue, may be illustrated by the recent experience of a country parson. The little son of a very respectable man asked his father, when he

brought home from his work a new tool, 'Daddy, did you pinch it?' This was not an example of child humour, but child inquisitiveness unrestricted by moral standards. And what perhaps is more significant, his parents did not seem in the least perturbed by the enquiry.

The recitation of our Lord's two Great Commandments at the Communion office when that service is attended by a body of instructed communicants is, we think, to be preferred to the recitation of the Decalogue.

THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT AND CONSCIENTIOUS SCRUPLES.

The President of the Northampton Free Church Federal Council (the Rev. H. W. Janisch), who welcomed the Roman Catholic Movement known as 'The Sword of the Spirit,' created to co-operate with other Christian Churches in this country, has felt compelled to withdraw publicly his support and to state his reasons for so doing in the *Northampton Mercury* of Dec. 10.

Mr. Janisch's reasons are manifold: the Pope's refusal to declare the war against Nazism to be a just war when requested to do so by President Roosevelt; the Pope's blessing of 'the rape of Abyssinia' and the unjust aggression against Albania; the Pope's failure to pronounce in favour of complete religious tolerance in Spain. Inasmuch as the Pope is the head of the Roman Catholic Church, and in his public acts represents authoritatively as no one else can the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, Mr. Janisch's indictment will weigh heavily with those who think that a Roman Catholic movement in England must be judged in the light of the Papal policy as a whole. Many of us think well both of the religious liberalism and the loyal patriotism of Cardinal Hinsley, but we are compelled to ask what is the Cardinal's attitude worth as indicative of the true attitude of the Roman Catholic Church in view of the Papal policy abroad?

Another count in Mr. Janisch's indictment is that

> 'Having obtained a measure of interested support [from all denominations in this country], the Sword of the Spirit Movement denied full membership or executive positions in the movement to any but Roman Catholics.'

This is a more domestic question and touches us nearly, as it offends the Englishman's sense of fair play, and we do not feel,

on principle, that we can either play or work with those who do not play fair. If we do play or work with them we feel, not that we are being good fellows or treating them as good fellows, but that we are encouraging wrong methods and standards. True co-operation in a movement should mean that all members of that movement, if it be a religious movement, are given equal religious rights within it. If such rights cannot be granted conscientiously by Roman Catholics to their fellow-Christians in this country, then their fellow-Christians are justified in declining to take part as outsiders with the insiders who claim the sole right to control and direct the movement. If it be argued, as it is by some notable English Churchmen, that in this matter our British Roman Catholics are only acting in accordance with their Roman Catholic consciences, and that we ought to respect their conscientiousness and not refuse to co-operate with them on account of it, a more serious issue arises. This Roman Catholic 'conscientiousness,' as Mr. Janisch asserts, would not, at the meetings of the Sword of the Spirit,

> 'permit prayer or even the repeating of the Lord's Prayer, or the dismissal of the assembly with a Benediction.'

But what kind of Christian co-operation is this which forbids Christian men and women to say the Lord's Prayer together aloud and to listen to the New Testament words of Benediction with which their assembly is dismissed? Surely such prohibitions cut at the very roots of Christian fellowship, and to submit to them would seem to make those who do so guilty of obeying man when he commands that which is contrary to the will of God. The primitive apostles claimed in a crucial issue that 'we ought to obey God rather than man.' And surely Mr. Janisch and his fellow Free Churchmen can claim the same justification for their action, which may seem superficially to be illiberal, but, viewed more profoundly, is a conscientious refusal to co-operate in practices which cut at the very root of Christian fellowship.

'No Persecution of Christians.'

The Pope declared in his Christmas Eve broadcast that one of the indispensable conditions of a victorious peace must be that there shall henceforth be 'no persecution of Christians.'

Why should the Pope insist only on the non-persecution of Christians? Of late years have not the Jews been more terribly and notoriously persecuted than Christians? Have not Communists, Socialists, Freemasons all been subjected to persecution during the period of the war? Have Christians any special right to claim exemption from persecution? There is nothing in New Testament teaching on which they can base such a claim. Indeed, just the opposite. One of the Beatitudes of Jesus runs: 'Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you' (*Mt.* v, 11). Moreover the history of Christianity must impress its students with the fact that persecution of Christians has proved a great moral and spiritual benefit to the Christian Church. Tertullian wrote about 200 A.D., 'The blood of the martyrs is the seed of Christians.' Perhaps a Christian may feel that he is not required to invite persecution or to provoke persecution, but he dare not claim as his right that he shall not be persecuted because he is a Christian.

Another query that the Pope's pronouncement raises is whether he is merely prohibiting the persecution of Christians by the secular authorities and by non-Christian political powers, or whether he is prohibiting the persecution of Christians by Christians? It may be confessed, and should be to-day confessed with tears of true repentance, that ever since the Christian Church obtained political power it has persecuted those whom it deemed to be schismatics and heretics. Mr. Spurgeon asserted on one occasion to a concourse of Baptists that whatever other Christian denominations had done in the way of persecution, the Baptists had never persecuted. When the applause had died down, he added: 'That is because they have never had the power.'

It is not unjust to assert that of all Christian Churches the Papal Church has been the most terrible and notorious persecutor of fellow-Christians. The Albigensian Crusade, the Spanish Inquisition, the Martyrs' Memorial at Oxford, the Papal medal struck to celebrate the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and a thousand other facts testify to the persecuting zeal of the Church of Rome. The Church of England is not blameless in this matter of persecuting fellow-Christians, as our Puritan historians have not failed to relate; in their turn, the Quakers of New England bear testimony to the cruel persecu-

tion of the Society of Friends by the Puritans—a melancholy history. It can be claimed, however, that there is not a single denomination of the Reformed Church to-day which does not utterly condemn and renounce such persecution. But there is a suspicion that the Church of Rome condones and justifies persecution and would even resort to it if it possessed the power. What has happened recently in Abyssinia and Spain seem to give grounds for this suspicion. We would therefore urge the Pope, should he speak again on this subject *urbi et orbi*, to renounce in the most absolute way that the Christian Church is ever right to persecute. Indeed, a Papal Bull to this effect would not only be welcomed by millions of Christians both inside and outside the Roman Church, but would do much not only to commend Papal policy to the secular world, but would also provide a most salutary check to the secularist persecution of Christians.

IN MEMORIAM

FREDERICK JOHN FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D.

On December 1, 1941, at the age of 86, Professor Foakes-Jackson died at New Jersey, U.S.A. The Modern Churchmen's cause owed not a little to his services. He, in conjunction with Professor Kirsopp Lake and Miss Dora Nussey, played a leading part in initiating the first Modern Churchmen's Annual Conference held at Ripon in 1914 on the eve of the Great War. He presided at its second Annual Conference at Rugby in 1915. That same year he helped to found the Birmingham Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union, of which Sir William Ashley became the first President. It must have given Dr. Foakes-Jackson no little satisfaction to learn before his death that his old pupil, Dr. H. G. Wood, had been appointed the first Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham.

Although educated at Eton and Trinity College, Foakes-Jackson will always be remembered academically as Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge. In his studies he was no narrow departmentalist, but possessed a wide culture and many-sided interests. As a member of the Theological Faculty of Cambridge, his interests were mainly Biblical and ecclesiastical.

Dogmatic theology and religious philosophy possessed little interest for him compared with ecclesiastical history. *Beginnings of Christianity*, a collection of studies in the *Acts of the Apostles*, undertaken with Professor Kirsopp Lake, constitutes his most outstanding contribution to ecclesiastical research. His essay on the romantic horse-thief, Margaret Catchpole, his grandfather's servant—used by Foakes-Jackson to illustrate the interweaving of fact and fiction in ancient narrative, and to stress the moral that the presence of fictitious details in a story ought not to be allowed to discredit its truth as a whole—will probably be recalled when Foakes-Jackson's more erudite essays are forgotten.

Research, however, was not really his sphere. His gifts were primarily those of an educationist. His writings have always seemed to us to have been characterized, not by profound learning nor by accurate scholarship, but by real insight, lucid exposition, and arresting freshness of treatment. He had a great gift of humour, and he selected illuminating, unforgettable incidents and *dicta* to illustrate his expositions. He was one of the most inspiring of tutors and produced a great body of brilliant pupils. It was said that at one time there were no less than ten Deans of Cambridge Colleges who had been tutored by Foakes-Jackson.

He was full of vitality and vigour—certainly no dry-as-dust don, and he had little patience with the faultily faultless precisionist. Perhaps we may cite the following conversation to illustrate this. We were discussing with him the merits of a younger Cambridge theologian much in favour in ecclesiastical circles. Foakes-Jackson was very disparaging in his comments. We replied, 'But surely he is a competent scholar; he does *know*.' Foakes-Jackson: 'Oh, yes, he knows' (with rising emphasis), 'he knows it *all*, but he knows it all *wrong*.' And then, in quiet tones,

> 'Although he wrote it all by rote
> He did not write it right.'

He loved and honoured sound learning and stood manfully for its promotion in the Theological Faculty of Cambridge University. He loved the Church of England, not only because of the richness and variety of her ecclesiastical life, but also be-

cause of her relationship to our ancient Universities, the effective symbol of his ideal that her final appeal, as a religious teacher, must be to historic truth and sound learning. In his religious outlook and valuations he was more closely allied to the eighteenth century than to either the nineteenth or twentieth. In the days of the Great War he resigned his many posts in his *alma mater* to become a professor in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. The learning and the liberal tone of his new environment appealed to him, but he was too devoted to the academic life of Cambridge not to miss much by his transplantation. His intense interest in English sport, especially in rowing; his delight in the society of the Senior Combination Room; his aesthetic sensitiveness to the varied lights of 'courts' and 'backs,' Senate House and Chapel, could find no adequate satisfaction in his new world. 'Foakie' was a loveable character, and those who enjoyed him most make no mistake in feeling that we shall not look upon his like again. He belonged to an England which has passed away. H.D.A.M.

WILLIAM FREDERICK GEIKIE-COBB

The death of William Frederick Geikie-Cobb, D.D., Rector of St. Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate, deprives the Modern Churchmen's Union of an old and stalwart member. Dr. Geikie-Cobb was appointed Rector of St. Ethelburga's by Bishop Mandell Creighton — a shrewd judge of character whose appointments invariably justified themselves. The new rector's position at St. Ethelburga's was not at first an easy one. There had been ceremonial scandals at the Church which had ended in violent conflict, and the new Rector's delicate task was to keep the mean between two extremes. This Geikie-Cobb succeeded in doing, not because he was timid, but just the reverse. He possessed sound principles and acted on them with consistency and courage. In his early days a strong High Churchman, he steadily became more liberal in his sympathies and enlightened in outlook. He was a firm believer in women's rights, and it was this, no doubt, which had not a little to do with his vigorous endeavours to secure reform in our marriage and divorce laws. Although he influenced national feeling in this sphere, and had

the satisfaction of seeing many of the reforms which he advocated become the law of the State, it has to be confessed that he had no influence upon the law of the Church, and his known readiness to administer that law in accordance with what he believed to be the spirit of Christ, led to his being viewed askance by the Church authorities.

He did much to beautify the interior of his little church and to popularize its services. The statistics of the attendance at his services were remarkably high. His congregation, which drew its membership from various quarters, became increasingly a fellowship under the influence of his leadership and teaching.

The *Times* of December 15 published a remarkable tribute to him paid by Lady Oxford :

> 'With the death of Dr. Geikie-Cobb I feel that I have suffered a personal loss. My acquaintance with him was slight, but whenever we met I felt that we were friends. He was not only a religious man, but he was a good man ; tolerant, kind, and broad-minded. He cared little for the conventions of the Church, but everything for the counsels of Christ, and he was never tired of preaching the religion of love. He was one of the first parsons who realized that short services, clear reading, brave preaching, and good music were suited to the requirements of the present day ; and his small, but beautiful, church was in normal times never empty. Although he had an excellent sense of humour, and a fervent desire to help and guide both the poor and the rich, he had no moral vulgarity, and in spite of his being a man of learning I never heard him say a stupid word. I never left the Church of St. Ethelburga without feeling that Dr. Geikie-Cobb had kindled my hope and strengthened my faith.'

Among his published works were the following : *Translation of Letters of St. Bernard*, being Vol. II of Catholic Standard Library, 1890; *Translation of Cornelius a Lapide on I and II Cor. and Gal.*, 2 vols., 1895; *Theology Old and New*, 1901; *Mysticism and the Creed*, 1914; *The Path of the Soul*, 1923; *The Humanist's Hornbook*, 1935. In their chronological order they exhibit his intellectual and spiritual evolution. *The Modern Churchman*, Vol. XX (1930) contains a valuable article by him on 'Marriage and Divorce in the Modern State.'

He had those gifts and graces which would have enabled him to administer a much larger sphere than his little city parish with benefit to both Church and nation, but the change in the administration of the Diocese of London which followed on the death of Creighton was favourable to the advancement of slighter men.

H.D.A.M.

SCIENCE: THE ENSLAVER AND THE LIBERATOR

By J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

SCIENCE began its career as a liberator. The development of the natural sciences required freedom of thought and inquiry and acted as a solvent of traditional beliefs and practices. It was inevitable that early champions of science such as the French Encyclopaedists should have been champions of individual freedom, not only because science would liberate man by giving him control over Nature, but also because it was a mental liberator.

But the results of any movement are not always identical with those anticipated by its protagonists, but are occasionally quite opposite thereto, and science has not been wholly a liberator. Or rather, having freed man from one pair of fetters, it has imposed on him another.

As is well known, scientific inquiry proceeds by discovering similarities of structure or behaviour among objects, and the classifying of these objects and the reduction of their behaviour to laws. This procedure has been fruitful of results by enabling the human mind to impose clear patterns upon the apparently confused collection of phenomena which present themselves to the five senses. But it is obvious that this method involves the obliteration of individuality. All members of a class are, in the eyes of science, not individuals but units. Thus scientific method strains out individuality as a cook strains out the pips when converting soft fruit into jelly.

Thus science in order to pursue its indispensable inquiries makes what is in effect a transformation of reality, converting a world of concrete individuals into a world of abstract units. To recognize this does not discredit scientific method, which provides us with a short-cut to accurate knowledge. No one will use addition when he has once learned the multiplication table, nor do laborious calculations when provided with a table of logarithms. But the fact should not be lost sight of that science

does convert the unique individual into a unit indistinguishable from a thousand or a million others.

This may appear to be a merely theoretical point; but it was no mere coincidence that when science began to be applied, it turned out to be no friend to the individual as such. Industrialism is applied science, dependent on scientific theory and technique, and it is not at all surprising that it should take the 'unit' view of man. This reduction of man from individual to unit status operates everywhere in modern industrial society, and the more elaborate the organization, the more likely is the individual man to be converted into a cog in a huge machine. This applies to the 'executives' as well as to the 'operatives' in a modern large-scale industrial concern. The same principle applies in the political and military spheres, for ours is a 'machine age' not only in the sense that innumerable machines are needed for its operation, but also because modern society is itself a machine, and the citizen is a part, a unit-part, of the several machines which make up society, industrial, political, military, and so on. We are all mechanized, whether we know it or like it or not.

But to reduce a human being to machine status is to deprive him of freedom, spontaneity and the power of producing or doing anything new or unprecedented, *i.e.* the product of individual creative activity. A machine's behaviour is merely uniform; it goes on repeating itself until someone turns off the power (for even the power is not its own). It should be noted that under a machine economy virtue consists in acting uniformly and mechanically. If a cog diverges from the normal it causes a breakdown.

Thus science, which was to have been the liberator, has led to the creation not only of material machines which need men to serve them, but of human machines who are themselves mere interchangeable parts of larger and more complicated machines, industrial, political, military, and so on.

This theme can be expanded at far greater length and in far greater detail than we have space for here. The reader may reflect what weapons science has put into the hands of those who desire to enslave their fellow-men. We have already seen what those who have tanks and dive-bombers can do to those

who have not. We have seen, also, what is possible to new techniques of propaganda. If the bomber can enslave or destroy the body, the radio can enslave or destroy the intelligence.

This tendency of science to depress the individual has, however, received recently more than enough attention, and has been exploited in the interests of a reactionary standpoint by the enemies of science who are jealous of its pre-eminence in the modern world. This suspicion of and hostility to science is evidence of a failure of nerve on the part of some of our intellectuals, and if these malcontents had their way civilization would stagnate and return to the mediaeval barbarism idealized by our dreamers ignorant of the realities of human history.

It may indeed be admitted that some of the consequences of the development of the natural sciences have been the reverse of fortunate, but such evils as have accrued are not to be disposed of merely by turning our backs upon science. The cure for these evils is to be sought rather by the further development of science, and by the rigorous application of such knowledge as we possess, without regard to the prejudices of the backward-looking and timorous. The present failure of our civilization should be regarded not as the result of too much science, but of too little, and of that too little ill applied. We have been fearless in our application of physical science, but we have been too hesitating in our application of our biological, physiological, and psychological knowledge. The causes of the scourge of our civilzation, war, will not be permanently removed even by the victory of a righteous cause, though that may be an indispensable condition. Victory in 1918 was not followed by permanent peace because the deeper causes of war had not been eliminated.

> 'These lie in the lack of ability, character and emotional development of man himself. If the forces he has created are to be readjusted and canalized to human service and welfare, it is urgent to fit man for the task. The recognition of this possibility and a concentration of effort in an endeavour to improve the quality of man, both of to-day and to-morrow, intellectually, emotionally and physically, would give a re-birth to hope.' [1]

This truth, that our failures have been due to man's inadequacy, has indeed been widely admitted, and this admission too

[1] From a paper read at the Conference on Science and World Order, on 28 September, 1941, by Mrs. S. Neville-Rolfe, O.B.E., of the British Social Hygiene Council, published in *Nature*, Nov. 29.

has been exploited in the interests of reaction by those who urge us to seek salvation in some kind of a retreat. But we must decline to be persuaded by these retreatists and defeatists. The truth is that there is already enough knowledge available in the spheres of biology, physiology and psychology to make very considerable changes for the better in human life, if only it could be disseminated and applied. 'The present urgency is to democratize existing knowledge under responsible auspices.' Our ecclesiastical educationists and our secularist educationists have managed by their antagonisms to hold up creative educational developments in the psychological and social spheres for two generations past. As a consequence there has been a most detrimental failure to introduce into our educational curriculum in the nation's schools the elements of social biology. Thus a biologically and psychologically ignorant population has grown up, and science has been deprived of an understanding public. Our ethical values, such as they are, are often quite unrelated to scientific facts, especially those of biology, and those relating to heredity and to bodily and mental health. We fight both moral and physical evil with methods as superannuated as the cross-bow.

It is not as if the relevant scientific knowledge were unwelcome when offered :

> 'That the younger generation welcomes information and guidance on matters of social biology is evidenced by more than a hundred thousand of the 16-25 age group who have attended *ad hoc* courses of lectures presenting a biological outline of how minds and bodies function, and encourage discussion on the related personal and social questions.' [2]

The trouble really is that this kind of knowledge is too carefully rationed by authorities who are equipped 'with a background of traditional dogmas as religion, of *laisser-faire* as social economics, of philanthropic charity as good citizenship, and an idea of the "equality" of man which ignores biological evidence.' Intellectual interest is easily aroused if facts and their implications for life are faithfully presented, and a strong emotional drive would also be forthcoming to implement and apply the knowledge. If the older generation, instead of whining about

[2] Mrs. Neville-Rolfe, *loc. cit.*

'the failure of science,' would stand aside and let the rising generation have the vital knowledge it needs and is willing to apply in practice, there would be no need to sound the retreat—that melancholy note so attractive to sentimental reactionaries.

It may be objected that to allow science to intrude upon the personal life is dangerous and will produce a generation of robots, on the lines of Mr. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World.* But why accurate knowledge practically applied should be more dangerous in the sphere of the personal life than elsewhere is not explained. Why is it safer for the personal life to be based on lies or superstitions than upon scientific truth? Mr. Aldous Huxley's engaging satire is really one of the signs of the retreat above alluded to in which our intellectuals are engaged. Mr. Aldous Huxley has himself escaped to America, but even there the confusion pursues him. In these days there is simply nowhere to retreat *to*! And you certainly cannot get away from science.

To anyone who reflects it should be obvious that to understand our own natures in the light of biological and psychological science will increase our personal powers of action, of endurance, of creation, of perception. Is this to make a man more of a robot? He who increases personal power and capacity increases personal freedom. 'Ignorance is the curse of God; knowledge the wings wherewith we fly to heaven.' But our intellectuals of the retreat are more ready to agree with the pessimist *Ecclesiastes*: 'He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.' But they have never done any scientific work themselves, either in the way of research or in the way of technical practice. As sophisticated spectators they look on while other people do the work, and instead of encouraging the workers, utter laments and prophecies of ill.

No doubt science shares the imperfections of all things human. Yet the history of science leads to the conclusion that it has been a bringer not only of material benefits but of spiritual and mental liberation. Its enemies have always been the enemies of mankind, and of life itself. Its technical applications have indeed produced some results that we may deplore, but these have not been the fault of scientists but of those who misapplied the knowledge it brought. And the science which has been ap-

plied has been primarily physical science; the sciences of life and of mind still remain virtually unapplied to many of the problems of human living. But it is the sciences which touch man's own nature that now call for application. Then man will have learned to control not only external nature but his own nature also. It is often said by our reactionaries that human nature cannot change; but no one knows the possibilities of human nature until these have been explored. No doubt there are limits to human capacities as to everything else, but that is no reason why we should be satisfied with a minimum achievement.

The vested interests which have grown up around the traditional methods of dealing with man's personal life may be expected to resist the application of new methods, and it would be a mistake to underrate the forces they can dispose of. But in view of the present state of the world it can hardly be maintained that those methods have been very successful, and it is hardly surprising if many people think it is high time for many changes.

HAS CHRISTIAN RATIONAL HUMANISM BEEN REFUTED?

By the Rev. D. E. H. Whiteley, M.A.

PERHAPS the most cherished 'wishful thought' among theological reactionaries is the view that recent theology has refuted once and for all the rationalistic and the humanistic doctrines of English Modernism. It occasionally happens that some substantial and respectable citizen is forced to insert in the local journal an advertisement of the following type:

> 'Alderman John Brown wishes to state that he is in no way connected with the person of the same name who was recently arrested for disorderly conduct.'

Christian rational humanism, which is exemplified in English Modernism, is often confused in the minds of its critics with atheistic rational humanism.

The atheistic rational humanists who flourished during the last century glorified Man and Reason. Those hopeful thinkers have been accused of glorifying them too much: in point of fact, they did not glorify Man and Reason nearly enough. They made one great mistake: what that mistake was can best be explained by means of a story.

> When my father was away on holiday one of his pupils, who knew where the garage key was kept, 'borrowed' his car. Finding that it would not go, he concluded that it was stiff from lack of use, and pushed it to the brow of the hill on which our house was built. The car glided down the hill and ran for about half a mile; it then came to a dead stop. At last he looked inside the bonnet, and found to his dismay that the magneto had been removed.

In the same way, the atheistic rational humanists believed that, as soon as the initial stiffness had been removed, *i.e.* as soon as the last king had been strangled with the bowels of the last priest, the car of humanity would run without trouble. This appeared to be the case during the favourable period of industrial expansion which occurred in the nineteenth century; but a full stop was reached in 1914. Aristotle has remarked that a hand cut off from the body is no longer a hand. A tram separated from its rails, and therefore from its source of power, is no longer in the full sense a tram. In so far as he can cut himself off from God, a man is no longer a man. Indeed, history records the existence of only One who was Man in the full sense. The term 'atheistic rational humanism' is self-contradictory; atheism robs man of his glory and of his hope, and is therefore anti-humanistic. My father's car, after the removal of the magneto, was no longer in the full sense a car, and for that reason it would not go. In so far as humanity can cut itself off from God, it ceases to be humanity in the full sense of the term, and for that reason it cannot succeed.

Why then has Christian rational humanism been confused with anything so totally different as atheistic rational humanism? We suggest the following reasons:

(1) Every age has its own peculiar thought-forms and its own peculiar phraseology. Both Christian and atheistic rational humanists tended to express themselves in the same characteristic manner.

(2) Both contended on the same side in the struggle fought to free Christianity from the clutches of Fundamentalism.

(3) It is just as unscientific to divide men into Christians and atheists as it is to divide them into Aryans and non-Aryans. Most individuals have some of the features characteristic of each group. Shelley and T. H. Huxley were rational humanists who had one foot in the Christian and one in the non-Christian camp. Christian rational humanism was confused with non-Christian rational humanism because there were so many theological half-breeds.

The present century has seen a reaction against both rationalism and humanism. In this reaction, as in the previous movement, both Christians and non-Christians have taken part. We may mention among the atheistic reactionaries Nietsche, Ludwig Klages, D. H. Lawrence and Adolf Hitler. Here is a most instructive passage:

> 'To the . . . doctrine of the infinite significance of the individual human soul, and of personal responsibility, I oppose with icy clarity the saving doctrine of the nothingness and insignificance of the individual human being.'

Who spoke these words? Most theological students would suppose that they emanated from the Barthian school. In point of fact, Hermann Rauschning puts them into the mouth of Adolf Hitler![1]

Barth and Brunner are increasingly anxious to dissociate themselves from the contemporary reaction against rationalism and against humanism. As early as 1926 Barth said:

> 'Do not let us share in the anti-intellectualism of these days';[2]

and Brunner is even more emphatic:

> 'The customary contempt for thought which we find at the present time, even in theology, probably has more to do with the irrationalism of the tendencies of the day than with the truth of Christianity.'[3]

[1] *Hitler Speaks* (Thornton Butterworth, 2nd imp., Dec., 1939). In the original the three dots (. . .) represent the word 'Christian.' A Barthian would of course have said 'Liberal Christian.'

[2] *Vom Christlichen Leben*, 1926. I quote from the translation published by S.C.M., 1930.

[3] I quote from a footnote to p. 241 of *Man in Revolt* (Lutterworth Press, 1939, 15*s*.), Miss O. Wyon's translation of *Der Mensch in Widerspruch*, 1937.

Barth and Brunner are not anti-rational—they have seen too much of the pagan anti-rationalism of modern Germany. It is still, alas, necessary to insist upon the fact that we who regard 'rational' as a term of approbation do not mean, as our critics seem to imagine, that man, by the unaided light of natural reason, can discover all the truth. On the part of man, faith is also necessary; and by 'faith' we mean just precisely what St. Paul meant, no more and no less: we do not mean the passive intellectual acceptance of a system of theological propositions. It is even necessary for us to state that we believe God's self-revelation to be essential; the fact that this is necessary proves, as nothing else could, how gravely we have been misunderstood. Against all anti-rationalism we hold fast to the great Christian truth that God gave us the talent of reason to use: and that if we bury it in the ground, if we contemptuously flout our Lord himself, who bade us love God with all our mind, we do so at our own grave peril. On this point Barth, Brunner and English Modernism stand firmly and unshakeably united. It is true that theological thought has moved away from Christian rationalism: it is equally true that the best theological thought is moving back again.

The same applies to Christian humanism. It can hardly be said that Karl Barth is in any sense a humanist, but Brunner and Althaus hold a position more nearly akin to our own.

> 'Althaus rightly protests,' Brunner tells us, 'against a tendency in the theology of the present day to deny the distinctiveness of man's being which is supposed to be the greater glory of the Christian faith.' [4]

M. Jacques Maritain, who is a Roman Catholic, and therefore automatically a rationalist, threw his weight into the scale in favour of Christian humanism in 1936 when *Humanisme Intégral* was published in Paris; in 1939 Geoffrey Bles published an English translation entitled *True Humanism*. Formerly his attitude towards humanism was unfavourable; perhaps it would be fairer to say that he was chiefly aware of the humanism which strives to make itself independent of God and is therefore basically materialistic. His outlook can best be gathered from *Three Reformers—Luther—Descartes—Rousseau*. These three are

[4] *Man in Revolt*, p. 467.

held to be the fathers of the modern age, and are condemned. Humanism as such is not explicitly attacked, but an anti-humanistic spirit informs such passages as this :

> 'And he (Luther) can win over to his theology all the greed, all the impatient sensuality, the putrid fermentation, mixed with hopes of reform, fed more by humanism and learning than by supernatural faith, in the Germany of his day.' [5]

But in the Introduction to *True Humanism* [6] he speaks of

> 'the profound accord between humanism and Christianity, considered in their essence.'

Elsewhere he says :

> 'In fact, the radical vice of anthropocentric humanism was that of being anthropocentric, not that of being humanism.' [7]

What occurred between 1928, when Maritain attacked humanism in *Three Reformers*, and 1936, when he supported it in *True Humanism*? What happened between 1929, when Brunner wrote an article in *Zwischen den Zeiten* [8] attacking rationalism, and 1937, when he defended it in *Man in Revolt*? Hitler came into power. It is an incontestable fact that, since that dismal event, the tide of European theology, which had been flowing strongly against rationalism and against humanism, has been flowing gently but unmistakably in their favour. I mention this chronological point not as a proof, but as a clue. There was formerly a reaction against rational humanism in which both Christians and pagans took part. Since the pagan side of the movement reached its finest flower in Nazi Germany, many of the Christians who formerly supported the reaction have begun to return cautiously but surely in the direction of the rational humanism against which they had reacted. It is absolutely untrue to say that Liberalism has been generally abandoned. The reactionaries who make pronouncements to this effect are unwittingly copying the method of the *communiqués* issued by the German High Command; I hasten to add that the likeness extends no further. Goebels states that a position has fallen in the hope that this lie will affect the morale of his opponents and so

[5] *op. cit.*, Hart Library ed., p. 10; pub. Sheed & Ward, 1932.

[6] p. xv.

[7] *Science and Wisdom*, tr. Wall, ed. Bles 1940, p. 73.

[8] This periodical, *Between the Ages*, was to Barthianism what the *M.C.* is to us.

cause its own subsequent verification. Reports that English Modernism has been refuted are of this nature: in point of fact, the tide is once again flowing in our favour.

One more misapprehension must be considered. The impression has grown up in some quarters that Nazism is an extreme form of the humanism which arose at the Enlightenment and was fostered by Liberal Protestantism. Paul Tillich, a German socialist, theologian and philosopher who has had the opportunity of watching the German situation from within, expresses himself in these words:

> 'I discovered that the modern trends of thought which are rooted in the period of enlightenment are substantially Christian, in spite of their critical attitude towards ecclesiastical Christianity. They are not pagan, as is often said of them. Paganism—especially in nationalistic garb—did not appear until after the World War (1914-1918) in connection with the complete disintegration of Christian humanism.'[9]

Humanism was not the mother of Nazism but its first victim. It is true that many former Liberal Protestants are now Nazis; but this does not mean that Schleiermacher begat Nazism. It is equally true that many former Socialists are now Nazis: Socialism and Liberal Protestantism can with equal truth be considered the seed-bed of Nazism.

Tillich is just as typical of modern theology as Barth or Brunner. 'Existenz,' 'demonic' and 'kairos' are among his favourite ideas. And yet he expresses the outmoded opinions which, according to the Bright Young Things of theological society, are now obsolete and occur only in the pages of that pitiable survival from a bygone age, the *Modern Churchman*. Here are some extracts from Tillich which read like excerpts from 'Signs of the Times':

> 'New knowledge can be won only by breaking through a taboo.'[10]
>
> The command to Abraham, 'Go out from thy country into a land that I shall show thee,' may signify for us
>
> 'Parting from one's habitual way of thinking and believing; stepping over the border of all that is a matter of course; radical questioning, and advancing to the new and unknown.'[11]
>
> 'Orthodoxy is intellectual Pharisaism.'[12]

[9] *The Interpretation of History*, p. 43.
[10] *ib.*, p. 23.
[11] *ib.*, p. 68.
[12] *ib.*, p. 34.

> 'The symbol most impressive for our time, comprehending the final depth of holy demonry, is the "Grand Inquisitor," as Dostoievsky visualized and placed him opposite Christ: the religion which makes itself absolute and therefore must destroy the saint in whose name it is established—the demonic will to power of the sacred institution.' [13]

This is not a description of any Church. It is the 'classical picture,' as a physician would say, of the disease to which every Church is liable, and from which some branches of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church are suffering more markedly than others.

Tillich makes a distinction between the 'manifest' and the 'latent' Church and declares that:

> 'The existence of a Christian humanism outside the Christian Church seems to me to make such a distinction necessary. It will not do to designate as non-churchly all those who have become alienated from the organized Churches and traditional creeds.' [14]

Modernism has risen from the dead!

I do not wish to imply that contemporary continental theology is solidly on the side of English Modernism. Reactionaries, not through any conscious dishonesty, but through the common human failing of noticing only what is favourable, have given a one-sided picture which suggests that European thinkers have utterly repudiated everything for which English Modernism stood. In this article, and in my former article entitled 'Is English Modernism out of date?' I have sought to present the other side of the picture as a corrective. The future is full of hope: atheistic rational humanism is becoming discredited; Christians are being led to realise that Christianity without rationalism and without humanism is fatally mutilated, and that 'reactionary reduced Christianity' is not enough. We hope that all will converge upon the full and true Christianity that is rationalistic and humanistic, upon the rationalism which says 'in Thy Light shall we see light,' and upon the humanism which can say 'Beloved, now are we children of God.'

[13] *ib.*, p. 80. [14] *ib.*, p. 48.

AN AMERICAN GRADUATION SERMON

By the Rev. Raymond C. Knox, S.T.D., Chaplain of Columbia University.

ON June 3rd, 1775, one hundred and eighty-six years ago, the Board of Governors of King's College, from which Columbia University has grown, considered at their meeting the design of a Seal which would thereafter be used as its appropriate symbol or emblem. The device selected was one prepared by Dr. Samuel Johnson, the first President, and as recommended by the committee appointed to make a report. Appearing on all subsequent official documents, as it will be impressed on the diplomas you are to receive, it is at once expressive and suggestive of the life and the spirit of Columbia. Its figure of Alma Mater is the original of the statue we see daily in South Court. To appreciate its full significance we need to examine its detail, and especially its inscriptions.

At the top is the Name written in Hebrew letters, *Jehovah*, in a triangle of light. In the centre, Alma Mater is represented as speaking the words, *Ori-El*, 'God is my light,' in recognition that He is the Source of the illumination of mind which it is her aim to impart. On an open Book which she holds in her right hand are the words in Greek, *Logia Zonta*, 'the Living Oracles' or the 'Words of Life.' Behind her are the lines of the rays of dawn, signifying the rise of the Sun of Righteousness with healing on his wings for all the nations. Around the Seal in a semicircle is the inscription in Latin taken from the thirty-sixth Psalm to be the motto of Columbia, *In Lumine Tuo videbimus Lumen*, 'In Thy Light shall we see light.'

No design could have been more discerningly and happily chosen. It impressively testifies to the convictions and the ideals which led to the founding of Columbia. It portrays the principles to which all the expanding activities of the University through nearly two centuries can be related. It has a profound meaning for us in the present. And in directing our gaze toward

* Preached in St. Paul's Chapel, Columbia University, June 1st, 1941.

the dawn, it betokens that the work and the achievements of Columbia shall in all future ages abide.

'God is my Light: In Thy Light shall we see light!' Throughout the Bible the oft-repeated metaphor to indicate the essential nature and character of God is Light. And the meaning invariably given to light is Truth. He is the God of Truth, the Being in Whom all truth inheres and from Whom it proceeds. He is the Creative Mind or Reason, the Purposive Intelligence and Will, whose truth and whose laws are deeply written in the whole structure of the universe, of which man is a part.

In the epic of creation in *Genesis*, which is a poetic narrative of remarkable insight, the coming of light, 'heaven's first born,' was seen to be the beginning of that long process of creation, of which we now more adequately know, from which there was evolved an ordered universe, governed by law, and the earth made a habitation for all living things. And man, created in the spiritual image or likeness of God, has thus the capacity of mind or reason increasingly to investigate and rationally to comprehend the boundless, mysterious universe to which he belongs.

So Wisdom, frequently described as Truth personified for the guidance of conduct and life, is spoken of as 'an effulgence from everlasting light': she reneweth all things, ordereth all things; against wisdom evil doth not prevail.' And for man to seek wisdom is the high service of God, and the way to find life; 'for nothing doth God love save him that dwelleth with wisdom. She maketh men friends of God and prophets.'

In the New Testament, Light is used pre-eminently of Christ. He is the Word, the Creative Mind or Reason of God, made flesh and dwelling among us, so that in the truth of His life there is light. In Him there is also seen the real nature of man, the self which each one is to express, for He is the true light which lighteth every man, into whose likeness in all things man is intended to grow. Christ is the Light of the world; and as His spirit and teachings are brought to bear on all the intricate issues of living and of human relationships, men shall not stumble in darkness but have the light of life upon their path.

Here in your studies your object has been in every field of interest to seek the truth: concerning the physical universe, its nature and its laws; the facts of history and the correct interpre-

tation of them; the influence and inter-play of political and economic forces; the conceptions of life and its meaning in great literature, in philosophy, in music and art; with an added awareness of the vast realms of truth waiting to be explored.

As you share in the spirit and the significance of the Seal of Columbia, all the truth which you have acquired is in fulfilment of the inscription chosen to be her motto, 'In Thy Light shall we see light.' You realize that truth wherever found is an enlargement of your knowledge of God. It is this realization, that all truth is of God, which gives you an understanding of religion worthy of a trained and mature mind. You will render an inestimable service to men as you discern and make evident that the truth which men discover, in every realm, is related to Him as its Supreme Source; that rigorously to seek the truth is the first acceptable way to do Him honour. Modern science, rightly regarded with its impartial methods of search and with its marvellous discoveries, is an effective channel for the spread of His light. The first of the two great commandments as cited by Christ is to love God with all the heart and all the soul and with all the mind. In His teaching the spirit of truth is the Holy Spirit. And from Him we have the assurance, 'ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'

There are special, urgent reasons why we need to proclaim and to uphold this sacred character of truth and of truth-seeking. For what is the stark evil which now threatens scholarship, all genuine intellectual activity, which is no less the menace to the security, the freedom of nations, including our own? Behind and impelling the assaults and the invasions of force is the claim that there is no truth, no law, no standard of right and of righteousness, higher than man, which all men and nations are to obey and by which they are judged. In their place is substituted the state, the one race, as the end, than which there is nothing higher to be served and which is to be made dominant. Even the word, truth, is debased by making it not that which should be objectively sought, but whatever distorted meaning can be given to it that will promote the state.

This is the flagrant denial of the God of Truth, as those who profess that ideology openly declare, and by their actions show that they do not believe in Him. So freedom is suppressed,

worship according to conscience prohibited, small nations are subjugated.

Only a conviction that is true and stronger than that false ideology can fortify men successfully to withstand this threat. And that conviction we have. We have it in the inscription which expresses the spirit and aim of this University. 'In Thy Light shall we see light!' For this, as we have seen, is the recognition that truth has its origin and validity in a Source above man and the state, Whom we reverence as God. Thus the truth and the laws in the universe so established cannot be ignored or perverted by man. They are to be diligently sought and conformed to whole-heartedly. As this conviction is firmly held, the foundation for sound scholarship is secure, the untramelled use of the intellect protected, the way to constantly expanding knowledge kept open; and in the service of God there is perfect freedom.

The Light in which we see light has a further significance. The illumination which streams therefrom also includes moral purpose, by which direction and a goal are given to life. It affords an intelligible answer to the most profound and personal of all questions, What is life for? Without moral purpose a man's life is in darkness. It is bound to be a baffled, a frustrated affair, with no discernible pattern or path. Without moral purpose a nation is weak, its energies scattered; there is no unifying aim to inspire the efforts of a people. Where there is moral purpose the people of a nation are made immune against an insidious propaganda by which their liberties would be destroyed. Men and nations go forward in the light as they perceive a superior, over-arching, moral end which each one and all of them are to serve.

How important is moral purpose to the attainment of life is desperately plain. Increasing knowledge, especially the discoveries of science, have put into men's hands enormous powers. That these were intended for human benefit, that they have vastly improved the conditions and possibilities of life, make us for ever indebted to the men and women of skill and genius by whom they were won. But there is, as we know, the dark side of the picture. These same forces in nature and the inventions made from them, can be and are seized by men of low desire

and brutal ambitions and turned into the more terrible instruments for destruction and death.

To counter-act and to prevent this disastrous misuse there must be the strong avowal of the inviolability of moral law and of the supremacy of ethical purpose. As these are honoured, enlarging knowledge will then invariably bring its beneficent results, and human society steadily advance. It is because the highest moral purpose and spiritual principles are found in the life of Christ, which as He showed, have their basis in God, that we see in Him the Light of the world. For His standard of greatness was not lordship and dominion over others, after the manner of earthly conquerors, but greatness measured solely in terms of contribution to human welfare, even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.

In the same light of His life we can gain a clearer vision of the end to be sought in meeting the difficult, unprecedented tasks which lie ahead. A re-ordering of our practices is necessary to fulfil the biblical injunction, 'There shall be no more poor in the land.' Sustaining and rewarding work must be possible for everyone. By some right adjustment, the rich, abundant material resources of the earth must be made available for all. There must be more adequate provision for intensifying and strengthening our cultural and spiritual life, for 'man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' Over-shadowing all, sinking the world in an abyss of darkness, is the catastrophy of war, which has shaken our civilization to its foundation and put all things in flux. To cite the words of a prominent engineer, 'we must face the perfectly plain, inescapable and inevitable fact, that when this war is over, the world will not resemble the world of 1939.'

But what will it resemble? Shall it be left simply to the play of blind, irrational forces because men have not sufficient intelligence, have no steadfast moral purpose, to mould it? If men and women of education do not demonstrate their ability to do so, there will be men of cruel cunning who will impose upon us their plans.

Again we find the immediate and the far-reaching significance of the motto, 'In Thy light shall we see light.' No one can specify all that should be undertaken. Repeated revision would

be necessary if one did. But if the minds of men are illuminated by truth, if their moral purpose is resolute, the pathway before them in which to go forward will be one of ever-expanding light.

In the Book of Exodus there is recorded a noteworthy and a suggestive incident.[1] Moses, it is said, was attempting 'to judge the people,' that is, to adjust the difficulties of one individual after another as they came to him. Then there was given to him this advice: 'The thing that thou doest is not good. Thou wilt surely wear away, both thou and this people that is with thee. Be thou for the people Godward, that thou mayest bring the causes unto God; and thou shalt teach them ordinances and laws, and shalt show them the way wherein they must walk, and the work that they must do.'

It was in following this counsel that there was duly formulated by Moses those few, comprehensive laws, epitomized in the Decalogue, which laid the foundation for the new Hebrew Commonwealth, and which have profoundly influenced all subsequent ages.

'Be thou for the people Godward, that thou mayest bring the causes unto God!' This is the unique, the most important task for which your education has qualified you. With a genuine sympathy for people—there is no substitute for that—with a thorough knowledge of facts, then penetrate into and take up the *causes* of our difficulties and confusion into the presence of Him in whose light we see light! And the constructive measures you shall thus be enabled to formulate will lay the foundation upon which to build a new world.

We see the nations which are valiantly striving to defend their lands and their liberties from a barbarous aggression. To those nations we are pledged to give our aid. We do so not only for our own protection, for self-interest, though that is undoubtedly involved. But 'from us to whom much has been given, much shall be required.' With our heritage, with our strength and resources, for us to remain aloof in fancied isolation, and to allow liberty to perish from the earth, would be to repudiate the ideals and the principles which brought forth our nation, and which we are determined at all costs to maintain.

[1] *Exodus* xviii, 13 ff.

With all other freedom-loving people we look forward to the day 'when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' To this end the causes of conflict must be removed. As the President of this University has written, we must 'first limit and then remove the causes of war.' Even in the darkness of battle the first rays of that light can be seen. Men are seeing the necessity, and are planning, for some form of federated or co-operative organization in the light of a greater security and freedom for all people, of a more sustained willingness to serve and to sacrifice for the common welfare. And the full noon-tide of that day shall come as men and nations are ready to base their actions on the moral truth that 'we are members one of another,' that 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.'

And the light in which we see light reaches its climax in the illumination of a creative faith. For light by its very nature is always creative. As a physical energy it has the power to awaken and to nourish the inner, growing forces of life. In the realm of the spirit faith is light because it has a similar power to release and to increase the inner capacity of man to grow and to create new forms of life. It gives a deeper understanding of the true meaning of facts — as Ruskin has defined it, faith is 'veracity of insight.' It can detect the presence of spiritual forces which cannot be counted or weighed, but whose province and potency are to direct the use of all material things. Faith is light because it gives to men the vision of some greater good to be gained, without which the people perish. And it supplies the spiritual energy which makes of that vision not a mere 'wish-fulfilment,' but a positive, attainable goal.

Thus every higher achievement of men, in science, in democracy, in social advance, has been the blended product of intelligence enlightened by truth and of the motivating power of a creative faith. As Professor Shotwell, speaking of the organization of peace, has pointed out, 'No system of law and organization can be of value without the living faith and spirit behind it and in it.'

When all knowledge, all organization and aspiration have behind them and in them the living spirit of faith, there can and

shall be established that new and finer order of living which Christ designated as the reign on earth of the Kingdom of God.

> Think not the faith by which the just shall live
> Is dead creed, a map correct of heaven,
> Far less a feeling fond and fugitive,
> A thoughtless gift, withdrawn as soon as given.
> It is an affirmation and an act,
> Which makes eternal truth be present fact!

BOOK REVIEWS

EDUCATION FOR LEISURE*

The general editor of the Christian News-Letter Books, of which this is No. 8, tells us that 'this series of books is designed to assist thought upon the relation of the Christian faith to present problems.' We live in a changing society; it is still an open question what the outcome of the change will be. It is the duty of Christians to be aware of what is happening and, while the situation is still fluid, to exercise their utmost influence upon the course of events. In politics the old party lines are vanishing and new groups are being formed. Christians ought to play a decided part both by thought and action in these developments. Those who are collaborating in the 'Christian News-Letter' and who producing these books invite all men of goodwill to join with them in an attempt to understand the principles at stake and the policies which must be pursued.

We have got as a nation to do much more hard thinking than has been our wont. It has been said that 'the average Englishman not only has no ideas, he hates an idea when he meets one.' During the last hundred years our general security and the settled framework of our society have made thought about fundamental principles seem unnecessary; but now that change is upon us we must ask the big and difficult questions which have been neglected. There is no law of nature which prevents Englishmen from doing this. We shall, however, find it hard work, and the general reader, for whom these books are intended, must not expect to be let off lightly. The sustained effort of thought, in which it is hoped individuals and groups in every rank of society will co-operate, is likely to unmask truths which we should prefer to ignore and duties which we should prefer not to have to undertake.

After this the reader cannot claim that he has not been warned. His patience is not demanded to read a long book, but his attention is required to read a concentrated one. In 66 pages Mr. Every discusses such vast and debatable topics as the State of Taste, Religious Tradition, Humane Education, Public Standards, *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, and concludes

* *Christian Discrimination*, by Brother George Every. (S.S.M., Sheldon Press. 1940. 1/6.)

with a Programme of Action. Mr. Every in effect offers a brief conducted tour of modern culture, with comments by a Christian cicerone; but the breathless and bewildered reader may be advised to cover the same ground more slowly, for there are good things in this book. Though the comments are Christian, they are not merely ecclesiastical. Perhaps the crucial topic is the defects of modern education from the Christian standpoint. Mr. Every's views are those of the intelligent conservative. He is all for the classics and mistrustful of science, as scientific education supplies merely information and does nothing to cultivate standards or tastes.

> 'An improved technical education is needed for the health and efficiency of industrial science, but it is important that we should realize that technical education is not education for leisure. It cannot provide the kind of education in judgement and taste which is necessary to make a really first-class technician, able to imagine unexpected technical developments. It is education for leisure, and not education for business, which moulds the quality of public opinion in any community, for it is in their leisure time that people do most of their thinking and feeling about one another, and the future, and the state of society. Only some of the people will ever be learned savants, and only a few of them will ever be specialised experts at any particular science. But all of them can be muddled and mystified and befooled by themselves and other people, and all of them should have a chance to know when they are being befooled and how' (p. 34).

One of Mr. Every's arguments for a classical education is the rather odd one that it provides acquaintance with a non-Christian civilization. This might be an inducement to a secularist parent, but is unusual in Christian circles. Mr. Every firmly grasps that one aim of education is to make people critical, and he uses the evidence supplied by the success of advertising to show how uncritical most people are who pass for educated.

> 'Possibly only a minority can be educated so that they are able intelligently to criticize and resist the standards operating round them. The capacity to do so is certainly a matter of intelligence rather than of virtue. Neither the Christian theologian nor the Christian critic, still less the intelligent sceptic, is any more virtuous than the simple Christian woman who sees no harm in a mock-Tudor villa or a sentimental picture, or, at first sight, in Utopian politics. But it does seem that it may be our duty to establish standards which can take the place of those traditional, unconsciously assimilated standards which have crumbled. Nothing can replace them but something consciously and deliberately fostered by authorities who are able to outweigh, by persuasion or compulsion, the weight of commercial advertisement' (p. 11).

The discussion of our three most popular hymn-books is illuminating. The contrast between the impersonal and anonymous character of the Prayer Book and the personal and sentimental outlook of many hymns is well brought out. Mr. Every's book is addressed to that rare bird, the Christian highbrow, and it is based upon the assumption that the Christian must be more intelligent than the non-Christian. Unfortunately congrega-

tions consist for the most part of the less intelligent, and any Christian revival is unlikely till this position is altered. A book such as this may suggest ways in which to commend the faith to the intelligent sceptic.

P. R. SMYTHE.

IRRATIONAL RATIONALISM*

Those who are familiar with the late Professor Trotter's *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War* will welcome the posthumous publication of some collected papers. While most of them deal with what may be called the philosophy of medicine and were originally addressed to medical bodies, they all contain matter of general interest, and some in particular deal with topics of great moment to the educationalist and philosopher.

The erudition and charm of the writer's style illuminates a paper on the 'Commemoration of Great Men,' in which he records the names of some of those humble people upon whose vile bodies epoch-making surgical operations were performed, reminding us 'they are the names of those who have borne more substantial witness than has yet been produced by any philosopher or theologian that all suffering is not in vain' — men and women who played a part in the 'victories of the human spirit over chaos' —a comforting thought for the times.

But it is where he is dealing more purely with the mental processes in articles entitled 'Art and Science in Medicine,' or 'General Ideas in Medicine,' or 'Has Intellect a Function?' that Professor Trotter's writing is most stimulating and suggestive. To-day, when writers like Sir R. Livingstone are reconsidering the bases of education, and the leaders of the Church are refurbishing their educational armouries, the contributions of a psychologist like Trotter are far from irrelevant.

Professor Trotter's warnings against the over-valuation of the intellect in human affairs should prove a salutary tonic to those who, in their endeavour to avoid the Scylla of the flight from reason, fall into the Charybdis of over-estimating the rôle which intellect rightly can play. Neither theologian nor rationalist will like to be reminded that 'The consequences of the confident use of reason in medicine have been gloomy enough'; or again, 'The historian is apt to be indignant at the obstacles to new knowledge offered by the censure of theologians and the persecution of ecclesiastics. Theologian and ecclesiastic have no doubt done their best, but the effect of their utmost zeal has been insignificant in comparison with that resulting from the conscientious use of rational mind.'

Other medical psychologists have drawn attention to the effect upon the most apparently rational processes of the intellect of subconscious emotional bias. Bleuler calls such thinking *'dereirendes denken,' i.e.* think-

* *The Collected Papers of Wilfred Trotter, F.R.S.* (Oxford Medical Publications, O.U.P. pp. 194. 1941. Price 10/6.)

ing that goes away from the facts (*de re ire*); and Dr. Graham Howe in this country has drawn attention to the mental tricks which he calls 'compulsive thinking.' These are danger-posts too little regarded in intellectual circles, and Professor Trotter, whose avowed object in writing thus is to improve the intellect as an instrument in the service of humanity, does well to remind us of them.

Professor Trotter also would have us think what we mean by our catchword of 'teaching children to use their minds,' and slyly hints that many teachers really mean their pupils to be moulded after the manner of Lady Bertram in *Mansfield Park*, who 'did not think deeply but, guided by Sir Bertram, thought justly on all important points.' It is good for the disciples of reason to be reminded from time to time that the world does not seem to be run by reasonable people, but by those who feel intensely about matters which they very little understand.

An intensely reasonable propagandist like St. Paul is unfortunately a rarity, but it is a type of which the Christian Church stands in great need to-day.

J. D. Pearce Higgins.

CHRISTIAN COMMUNISM*

From time to time intelligent and learned laymen (the English philosopher Locke was one and Seeley another) have resolved to read their Bible for themselves, putting aside all ecclesiastical glosses, and seeking to be guided by the light of reason. In such cases startling results have usually followed. Dr. Guillet has acted in this manner, and the consequences have been no exception to the general rule.

He first discovers that the unique, central message of Jesus was: 'The time has now come, God's Kingdom is near: repent and believe the good news.' This is the continuous topic; the rest is subordinate and supplementary. But what was this Kingdom?

> 'The Kingdom of God was plainly intended to be a spiritual kingdom *with an economic content* "in this present world." *In this present world* those who are truly surrendered to God and have under the inspiration and guidance of the holy Spirit formed together a Kingdom or Society or *Communion* of God—for a kingdom is not a single person but a society — will supply all one another's needs with God's aid and under His Guidance.'

In Dr. Guillet's view the tragedy of the Christian centuries has been that what was 'simply a corollary and by-product of the Kingdom of God on earth,' *i.e.* eternal life in the world to come, has been placed in the centre of the picture, displacing the purpose for which Jesus lived and died. It should not be supposed, however, that what we have here is just another

* *The Forgotten Gospel*, by Cephas Guillet, Ph.D. (The Clermont Press, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. 1940. $2.50.)

economic interpretation of the message of Jesus; as Dr. Guillet puts it:

> 'The Kingdom of God is primarily *within those forming it,* as a vision and an ideal: "Lay up for yourselves *treasures in heaven,* where moth and rust do not corrupt . . ." All the rest — food, clothes, land, homes, wealth, honour, friends, life abundant and life eternal — *all* the rest is "*over and above,*" a by-product, not to be sought in itself or for its own sake, but added surely as a corollary and consequence of the spiritual kingdom.'

When anything else, be it paradise above or utopia below, is substituted for this spiritual kingdom, 'the Kingdom of God disappears and the Gospel of Jesus is defeated.' That this disappearance and defeat took place is attributed by Dr. Guillet in no small measure to the Apostle Paul, who preached a gospel of the Cross while Jesus preached a gospel of the kingdom.

> 'What Paul was thinking of was personal salvation from our sins into Paradise through the Church and the Cross. What Jesus was thinking of was the conversion of the world into a good Society through the establishment of the Kingdom of God. Jesus's mission was to save the world not through his death into a heaven above, but through his life into a heaven here.'

In Dr. Guillet's view, 'the only sufficient answer to the challenge of the Russian Commune is the Christian Communion.' He asks whether we have enough faith in God and in one another to form that sort of fellowship in the world. In his view the attempts of desperate men to establish a Commune by violence are a result of the failure of the Christian Church to establish a Communion:

> 'If now a Commune is arising, not Christian but anti-Christian, not religious but anti-religious, flowing not from the spirit of love and goodwill but the spirit of resentment and hate, and inspired and managed not by God but by the Devil, whose fault is it?'

There is, of course, a good deal in all this; more indeed than churchmen care to recognise. The idea of the kingdom of God originally was the idea of a 'made-over' earth, and 'the life of the world to come' *was* life in that transformed world. The postponement of this 'world to come' to the indefinite future, or to the experience of the individual soul after death, was perhaps inevitable. The 'charitism' of the primitive Christian communities was the kind of communism envisaged by Dr. Guillet, and its sacrament, the *agapé,* was its symbolic expression. The replacement of the *agapé* by the mass was symbolic of the abandonment of the communistic idea. It may well be that the revitalization of the Church (if such a thing is to be looked on as possible) will come out of the more or less spontaneous formation of groups of individuals united by some emotion like the old 'charitism' as well as by convictions and ideals held in common. 'Good churchmen' will not like Dr. Guillet's book, but it will do them all the good in the world to read it if it induces a 'conviction of sin.' J.C.H.

WAR AND CRIME*

Dr. Hermann Mannheim, like his colleague Dr. Karl Mannheim, is now at the London School of Economics, where he holds a Lectureship in Criminology having previously been Judge in the Court of Criminal Appeal and Professor of Criminal Law in Berlin. This volume is an expansion of lectures given at London and Cambridge in 1940, which without saying anything very new, provides an example of the interesting work that can be produced by a lawyer using sociological technique.

The book is divided into three parts. The first discusses the analogies and contrasts between war and crime. It is argued that the distinction between them was not drawn because group quarrels or 'wars' were thought to be in principle superior to individual crimes, but according as the injury fell upon a member of one's own group or upon outsiders. With the decline of the influence of the Church at the time of the rise of national sovereign states, all attempts to define the conception of a *bellum iustum* were given up for discussions on the *ius in bello*, and thus mankind tragically failed to stigmatise certain types of war as criminal and to treat them accordingly. The economic, physical and psychological causes of war are then somewhat sketchily discussed, and as may be expected, no simple conclusion is reached.

The second part deals with the influence of war on crime and includes a detailed consideration of the war of 1914—18 and of the prospects for this war. The question arises, will less war mean more crime?

In the third part Dr. Mannheim returns to the problem of International Law. The result of concentration on *ius in bello* has been actually to favour aggressor states. Not only does it fail to draw a distinction between just and unjust wars, but it also fails to allow for the individual element in warfare, *e.g.* isolated individuals defending their homes. Criminal law, on the other hand, does not do justice to the *group* element in crime.

> 'Traditional legal theory has failed to keep pace with recent economic, social and political developments. In an epoch in which, apart from the child and the juvenile, it is mainly the State and the Corporation that turn to crime, in an epoch dominated by the ideas of mass action, of corporate action, and of totalitarianism, the criminal law is in danger of losing most of its ground if it fails to evolve new conceptions of group responsibility for crime, if it continues to ignore the wrongs done by the State and the Corporation, just as International Law ignores the right of the individual' (p. 175).

The last chapter discusses the problems of force, bringing a verdict of guilty against a corporate entity like the State, minorities who may disagree with the State's policy, and whether rigid adherence to non-intervention in the internal affairs of another State is possible. Much of the book is tantalisingly brief: we could wish for more.

RONALD PRESTON.

* *War and Crime*, by Hermann Mannheim. (Watts & Co. pp. 208. 1941. 10/6 net.)

CONCERNING THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE *

There is a Modernism and there is a mysticism, and these are sometimes unsympathetic to each other. But the true and devout Modernist will keep the windows of the mind open, and the genuine mystic will never wish to dictate. And because of this, readers of the *Modern Churchman* may turn with grateful appreciation to the teaching of Mrs. Adela M. Curtis, which will open to them fresh fields of spiritual instruction, even though her simplicity on 'Contemplation' may at first seem to jeer at their desire for intellectual assurance. For she advises nothing like the Eastern Yoga and says that contemplation is not an abnormal state only to be attained by a few specially constituted souls. It is not 'meditation,' a thing of which the little child is incapable, though even he can 'contemplate,' and she quotes as a sort of watchword for the comtemplative the unwritten saying of our Lord: 'He that wonders shall reign; and he that reigns shall rest. Look with wonder at that which is before you.' Mrs. Collins, indeed, warns us against 'an undisciplined mind' and 'a disordered mind' and 'the clumsy hands of ignorance,' and to contemplate, she teaches us, is 'to rise beyond thought,' for 'the contemplative has but a single object in life: to learn of God and to serve Him only.' For her there is a dangerous 'silence' and also an undesirable vagueness and self-consciousness in the 'quiet time' of the Buchmanites, though she emphasises the virile force of the silent life. Contemplation, she would say, is a super-consciousness made up of Worship, Adoration and Love: it is to be cultivated in comradeship and is to be an 'active ministry to the glory of God and the good of all men,' and is destined to give men character worthy of being carried on into the Beyond—an aim well worthy of study and pursuit by all seekers of Reality. There may be some hesitation in accepting the estimate and use of the Revelation in the booklet *Contemplation for Everyman,* though it contains gems of helpful and devotional interest, but in *The Divine Law of the Word* the reference to Incarnation may be warmly welcomed, as the author announces: 'Some word is being made flesh throughout the term of each mortal life.' If there is in Modernists something of divine aspiration to which such spiritually practical teaching appeals and an eager reaching-out after Truth, they may find both for laymen and for preachers some very illuminating exposition of the Wisdom Books of the Bible in the last-mentioned book. *Proverbs, Psalms, Wisdom* and the New Testament as well are commented on with very remarkable insight, and many who read the book will have cause to rejoice because of fresh and suggestive light thrown on many familiar passages.

H. J. TRUEMAN.

* *The Divine Law of the Word,* by A. M. Curtis. (Publ. by Community House, Bridport, Dorset. 3/6. 1939.)

Contemplation for Every Man, by A. M. Curtis. (Publ. by Community House, Bridport, Dorset. 1/6. 1936.)

GEOLOGY AND GENESIS*

Geology and Genesis Reconciled is an extremely interesting book. Its author has an ardent desire not merely to bring to an end the old feud between science and religion engendered by the Church's early opposition to Evolutionary Theories, but even to make science 'the handmaid of religion.' Most churchmen to-day, and certainly all Modern Churchmen, would be in whole-hearted agreement with Mr. Martin's desire if he meant by it that religion and science, being both concerned with God and His world, cannot, when rightly understood, conflict. They would maintain that in the early days religion failed to understand either the possibilities of evolution in general or the existence of processes of evolution within the Bible and religion themselves, while science had on its side too easily assumed that its new discoveries either did, or could provide an ultimate explanation of things rather than a description or history of their appearances, behaviour and growth. Both sides are now wiser and there are welcome signs of mutual understanding and co-operation.

No doubt Mr. Martin's book is one of these signs, and it is full of most interesting information in a popular form about the early history of our earth as this is recorded on the rocks and of suggestions indicating designing mind and spirit behind the world process. Yet in his anxiety to resolve the quarrel of science and religion, Mr. Martin makes himself seem almost a fundamentalist with regard to the Bible. His method is to show that the early statements about Creation in Genesis, such as 'Let there be light' and 'God divided the light from the darkness', correspond in fact and order to the progressive evolution by stages of the universe from Light-Energy, the ultimate source of all that is, through gaseous atmospheric changes and by a sort of Bergsonian intelligent *élan vital* at the heart of things, to the world as we know it. This seems to assume that the Genesis narrative was written not as primitive theological speculation in somewhat anthropomorphic pictorial language, but as a definite description of the facts of evolution either by someone with full knowledge of those facts or by an irrationally directed instrument in the hand of God, either of which alternatives the best theologians of to-day would find harder to accept than the theory of evolution. When further 'Let' in 'Let them be for lights in the firmament' is strained to mean 'allow,' implying that the lights had been there before but not 'allowed' to appear owing to the gaseous pall round the earth, and when of Adam and Eve it is said:

> 'May we not assume that in Adam and Eve were two creatures who varied somewhat from their fellows, and that being isolated in the Garden of Eden by their Creator they were prevented from losing their characters of humanity by that very isolation, and thus passed on to their family the benefits of their variation?' (pp. 97-8)

* *Geology and Genesis Reconciled*, by Edward A. Martin, F.G.S. (Skeffington and Son Ltd. 1939.)

some theologians will begin to whisper '*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*'

The science of geology must recognise the findings of the science of higher criticism. Otherwise instead of reconciliation we shall have confusion and obscurantism back again in our midst. We must recognise that revelation may itself also be progressive, evolutionary and often in general terms, rather than given in detail once and for all, though not fully understood and therefore to be explained in detail cryptosymbolically in each generation to suit its peculiar stage of knowledge. This latter was the old way of Philo, a scientist of his day.

Genesis is a most interesting primitive theological speculation anthropomorphically expressed in categories suited to describing the activity of a purely transcendent Deity and to Occasionalism. Evolutionary categories cannot in detail be secretly understood or introduced under such expressions as part of the original intention of Genesis, however near the truth Genesis, rightly understood under its own thought-forms and re-interpreted generally in ours, may have come.

W. RICHARDSON.

CONFIRMATION PREPARATION*

*Talks in Preparation for Confirmation,** by the Headmaster of Liverpool College, is a very useful addition to the number of books already available for the purpose. It is a thoroughly sane, sensible and generally well-balanced series of preparation talks, designed for use by those who have to give similar courses, or to be put into the hands of those confirmed as a reminder or a further inspiration and instruction.

Rightly in view of his audience, Mr. Howard spends some time at the beginning on fundamentals, such as the existence of God, and the ways in which God reveals Himself to man. He then goes through the service of Baptism, the Church Catechism (without, however, mentioning the revised edition of the Catechism published by the *Modern Churchman* some years ago, and still available) and the Confirmation service, explaining, perhaps too briefly, the difficult points, and expanding somewhat on the Apostles' Creed. For the services of Baptism and Confirmation he uses the 1928 version. He practically confines his writing on the Ten Commmandments to the first four, saying, or at any rate implying, that treatment of the last six may be found in plenty of other places. We hope his hearers go to those other places. Perhaps they do; but one cannot help feeling that the Christian way of life, built up upon the Decalogue as interpreted by Jesus in the Gospels, is the best foundation upon which to build an exposition of Christian doctrine; nor, in these present times, can we be entirely confident that our boys and girls have been brought up to a Christian way of life. Here we have, of course, raised a big question, and it may well be replied that those

* *Talks in Preparation for Confirmation*, by the Rev. R. W. Howard, M.A., Headmaster of Liverpool College. (National Society and S.P.C.K. 4/-. 1941.)

who come to us to be prepared for Confirmation are *ipso facto* already instructed in Christian living. They certainly ought to be.

The last quarter of the book (some forty pages out of a hundred and sixty) is devoted to the Holy Communion, theoretically and practically. No one will call this disproportionate.

The writing abounds throughout in witty illustrations, and is wisely kept as concrete as possible. There are many stories of real men in action (such as that of Dr. Noel Chavasse, V.C.), some of them familiar stories, some less so; all will capture the imagination of boy or girl readers or hearers. Imaginative stories and parables also abound. Each chapter ends with a summary, very useful to those who have to deliver similar talks. This, Mr. Howard says, has been duplicated and given out after each talk to his boys. Is this not rather spoon-feeding? Another possible practice, which I have found valuable myself, is to make the candidates write up the lessons in note form; this has to be given me before the next talk, and I then return it, corrected. Some boys like to put questions on paper which they would hate to put orally, and they may need long answers; the amount of labour involved is considerable. But I have found that this method gives me a valuable insight into the minds of my hearers, and involves a degree of co-operation between them and me, which is unobtainable if they merely listen and read.

One other minor point. On page ix of the introduction Mr. Howard says: 'Every candidate is personally commended by the school to the vicar of his parish, and vicars are cordially invited to be present at the Confirmation service.' It is of course a most praiseworthy practice, followed by many school-chaplains. Back us up, ye vicars and rectors, if you receive such letters! There is at least one parson, formerly a chaplain, now a headmaster, who has often been much discouraged by getting back from the parochial clergy either no acknowledgment at all, or else letters saying, with more or less asperity, that Confirmation preparation ought to be left in the hands of the parish priest (during a boy's three to six weeks' holiday?). Unfortunate school-chaplains and parson-headmasters! You come in for much abuse! Perhaps some of it is due to the tremendous opportunities which are yours.

W. H. OLDAKER.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

TRUTH IN THE PULPIT

SIR,

Mr. Jarratt may rest assured that I am far from satisfied with the way in which Truth is being presented in many of our pulpits to-day, if for no other reason than that I am very dissatisfied with my own efforts at getting across the good news of Christ to the occupant of the pew, and that quite a number of my brethren share the same dissatisfaction in regard to their own sermons.

Our task is an exceedingly difficult one. We should of course study the Doctrinal Report, but I doubt whether it quite meets the situation of to-day. If I may guess what is in the mind of the man in the street—and at best it is a hazardous guess — he is somewhat bewildered by the divergence of opinion existing in the worship and teaching of those who claim to speak in the name of Christ. What is needed is a frank recognition of our differences, but also a strong affirmation of the unity underlying those differences. My own Diocesan Bishop, Dr. Hunkin, in his little book *The Gospel for To-morrow,* the value of which is out of proportion to its size, has given us a valuable lead when he says :

> 'Christian beliefs and practices can be roughly divided under three headings, corresponding to the £ *s. d.* columns of money sums. In the first column (the £ column) will be set things of fundamental importance. They are comparatively few in number. In the second (the *s.* column) things of interest, with a certain value of their own, but not essentials. In the third colmn (the *d.* column) minor things, not to be despised, but to be kept in a quite subordinate position.'

Since the issue of the Doctrinal Report we have witnessed in a most terrible manner a cynical and open disregard of Christian standards which compels many to ask themselves the question whether they are just conventions of society, to be discarded if found inconvenient, or whether they belong to the structure of reality. The problems of sin, suffering and evil press upon us with an insistence unknown to the Victorian age. Everything is in the crucible, including the order of society to which we belong. It is somewhat disconcerting to be informed by an academic teacher of philosophy that after two milleniums and a half of intensive speculation, carried on by the most powerful minds of Europe, the only proposition which could be said to be generally accepted and agreed upon by philosophers of all schools of thought, amounts to no more than this : 'it is possible that something may exist' (*cf. The Study of Theology,* edited by Dr. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford, 1939, p. 68). After reading such a statement we can understand the widespread confusion and deep-rooted unsettlement which exist in Europe to-day.

Less and less do I believe that intellectual difficulties can be answered from the pulpit of the ordinary parish church. The positive side of the Christian message, with as few trimmings as possible, should be given. Where it is at all practicable discussion groups should be formed, and the vicar and curate should meet the layman on terms of equality, and welcome a frank discussion of all those subjects which bear upon their own individual lives, social as well as religious. Judging from forty years of experience, the average person likes a sermon not lasting much more than a quarter of an hour, in which he is not called upon to think too much, and which concerns his own every-day life. No two parishes are exactly alike, hence to whatever new sphere the parish priest may go he must be a learner as well as a teacher. I wish the Modern Churchmen's Union would take as the subject of their Annual Conference 'What is the Church's message for to-day and how to get it across?' It would help many of those who do not belong to them and yet feel that Modern Churchmen have their place in the Church of England.

W. H. Rigg.

St. Mary's Vicarage, Launceston.
January 1st, 1942.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION—DEFINITION DEMANDED

SIR,

May I say that I have read with much interest and satisfaction the views put forward by Mr. Henderson and yourself in the December *Modern Churchman* on the subject of 'Religious Education.' I was especially impressed by your quotation from the R.A.F. chaplain's letter; for I feel sure that what I may call 'the psychological approach,' which he commends, is the key to successful religious teaching. Unless we can appeal to motives, tendencies, interests already existent in the minds of our pupils, our labours are like to prove vain. As I have elsewhere shown, the special merit of the (elementary) educational system of that great educationist, Plato, is the way in which he bases it on the innate tendencies and characteristic features of the child-mind. He first taught the psychological approach, which subsequent educationists, to their shame and the sorrow of their disciples, have so largely neglected.

But I have one quarrel with most of those who have been discussing this subject. They all (or almost all) appear to use the expression 'religious education' for what ought properly to be called 'instruction in the doctrines of Christianity.' And this is, to my mind, a very different thing from 'religious education,' which ought to mean 'education (or child-training) which is, in all its branches and all its stages, religious in character.' Obviously this is something far more comprehensive than 'doctrinal instruction' or the 'Divinity' and 'Scripture knowledge' of our school-days. But to explore its implications would require more space than I dare claim here.

In conclusion, I would suggest that those who are most ardent in pressing for 'religious education' should explain precisely what they mean by the expression before they invite our support and ask us for a blank cheque; and I, in turn, would invite them to cease using the term 'religious education' if what they mean is not 'religious education' but something much narrower in scope.

R. G. BURY.

MODERNISM AND UNBELIEF

SIR,

It is unfortunately only too true that the term 'Modernist' is anathema to many devout Christian people, and consequently it is most essential that in dealing with them we should not only speak the truth in love, but at the same time exercise 'the wisdom of the serpent.' I have found from personal experience that one good way of doing this is to tell these people a simple story, and then leave them to draw the moral for themselves.

One such story is as follows. A friend of mine, who was the rector of a country parish in Sussex, had amongst his parishioners a devout, well-educated, benevolent old lady who took the greatest interest in the services of the church. One day she said to him, 'Rector, why do you allow Mr. So-and-so to read the Lessons?' My friend replied, 'But why not? He is an excellent reader.' 'That may be,' said the old lady, 'but he is not a Christian; he does not believe the Bible.' The rector answered, 'How do you make that out?' She replied, 'Why, he teaches the boys in school that the earth goes round the sun, and what does it say in the Bible? "He laid the foundations of the earth that it should never move at any time."'

ED. H. LEALE (retired Vicar).

Starrs Green, Battle, E. Sussex.
December 26th, 1941.

THE TRUTH ABOUT SPIRITUALISM

SIR,

I have just read Canon Anson's book, *The Truth about Spiritualism,* which was reviewed in your issue of last June. There is much in the book that lends itself to criticism, but I shall confine myself to Chapter ix, on 'Spiritualism as a Religion.'

Canon Anson does not make it plain to his readers that modern Spiritualism claims to be a new religion; he does not point out the danger of Spiritualism to the Christian faith and the Christian Church. Spiritualism has become widely accepted as a religion, and the séance as a substitute for the worship of the Church. There are indeed some spiritualists who remain within the membership of the Church, where they ought to be and where they are welcome; but, on the other hand, great multitudes of men and women have been lost to the Church as the result of their acceptance of the spiritualistic creed. This is particularly true of Glasgow, which has a larger proportion of spiritualists in its population than any city in the world—such is the claim that spiritualists themselves make. The Christian who becomes a spiritualist almost invariably ceases to be a Christian in the ordinary acceptance of the word, though it is not easily explicable why anyone, just because he believes in the possibility of spirit communication and has received what he is convinced are genuine spirit messages, should forsake his Church, its worship and its service, and turn his back upon the Holy Table.

Spiritualistic writers now speak quite openly of the Spiritualist Church, as distinct from the Christian Church. It has its own creed set forth by the Spiritualists' National Union in its seven cardinal principles, and it is a creed with no place in it for Jesus Christ. The seven cardinal principles are: (1) the Fatherhood of God; (2) the brotherhood of man; (3) continuous existence; (4) communion of spirits and ministry of angels; (5) personal responsibility; (6) compensation and retribution in the hereafter for good or ill done on earth; (7) a path of endless progression. No confession of faith in Jesus Christ is found there. His Name, the Name which is above every name, does not receive even so much as a mention.

What does spiritualism think of Jesus Christ? Where does it place him? The late Sir William Barrett in his well-known book, *On the Threshold of the Unseen,* declares that spiritualism is the handmaid of faith. In a public lecture in Glasgow he warned his hearers of the folly of making a religion of spiritualism; and in a private conversation with the present writer he used words like these: 'Spiritualism is the outer court; the Church with its worship and sacraments is the inner shrine.' The writings of the late Sir Oliver Lodge clearly reveal his profound reverence for our Lord, and in *Raymond, or Life and Death,* he declares that the greatest thing about the after-life is that it means 'nothing less than the possibility of a glance or a word of approval from the Eternal Christ.' But when one comes into contact with what may be called organized spiritualism, the atmosphere is strangely different.

Spiritualists who deny the Divine Sonship of Jesus Christ and forsake the worship of his Church are making what Sir William Barrett called a 'fatal mistake.' Is the Church of Christ in our land aware of this danger from spiritualism to her life and teaching? Is Canon Anson aware of it? If he is, then he ought to have sounded in this particular chapter of his book a loud, clear warning note. And this is lacking.

F. D. LANGLANDS.

The Manse, Galashiels.
23rd December, 1941.

WOMEN AND THE PRIESTHOOD

SIR,

As one who believes passionately that the survival of Christianity is dependent on its Modernist interpretation, I am thankful for the work of the M.C.U. There is, however, one cause, entirely consonant with its principles, that is rarely mentioned in the pages of the *Modern Churchman*. I refer to the ministry of women in the Church.

The arguments for the admittance of fully-qualified women to the priesthood with the same status as men are well known. Is it not both expedient and urgent, and essentially practical at the present time, that the full collaboration of women in the great task of the Church of Christ be encouraged?

Will not you, Sir, advocate that the M.C.U. now *actively* champion this cause, in order to secure for the Church the contribution that women would undoubtedly make to the work that lies before her.

DOROTHEA H. G. REEVE.

107 Church Lane, Normanton, Yorks.
December 29th, 1941.

CHRISTIANITY AND CHURCHIANITY

SIR,

In thanking you for your article on Christianity and Churchianity in the December issue, I venture to send you an illustration of Churchianity, coming within my recent experience.

About a fortnight ago, we were told in a sermon that people take too much on themselves in their religious life: they retire into private for prayer, make their confession in secret and ask for Divine forgiveness on their own responsibility. Such people have no certainty that they are forgiven: the only way they can be sure is to go to the priest and receive absolution. The impression conveyed was that absolution was the act of the priest and that the only guarantee the sinner had was due to the peculiar prerogative inherent in the priesthood.

I have been a member of the Church of England for sixty years, and I do not remember hearing such doctrine put forward during the whole of that time in such an unqualified form.

J.R.F.

SIR,

I think that the people of this country, though now generally indifferent to ecclesiasticism and sacramentalism, are still essentially Christian, and therefore deeply interested in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ.

I can imagine no better foundation for a revived religious education, in schools and elsewhere, than books setting forth, in the light of the best modern scholarship, the clearest statement possible of what are believed to have been the actual actions and teaching of Jesus Christ.

A friend of mine used gently and effectively to correct her children's natural tendency towards exaggerations and inaccuracies by saying to them, 'Now! As true as you can!'

Are the people not entitled to ask of their official teachers that their teaching should be the truest possible in the light of all available knowledge and scholarship?

It seems strange, at this time of day, that we should still be left to learn and repeat known accretions, inaccuracies and interpolations which modern research has discredited. A.A.R.

PARISH COUNCILS AND RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION.

SIR,

Mr. T. J. Wood's letter in your issue for December reminds me of a plea by a well-known member of the Church Assembly a few years ago.

He suggested that Parish Councils should be something more than dry discussions on organization and purely material matters, and that papers should be read, and discussed, on current religious difficulties which vex the minds of laymen, and for that matter the clergy also. Such, for instance, as mistakes and errors arising from mistranslation, and the nature of the soul and the after-life, in which everyone is intersted, and which the clergy seldom venture on.

The suggestion was received coldly and secured no support. I have spoken of this proposal with many friends, clergy and laity, and find that the great majority of the clergy are dead against it: but the majority of the laity to whom I spoke of it were greatly in favour of it. I gathered that the dislike of my clerical friends was due to:

(*a*) The feeling that very few of them were competent to deal with questions which might be asked.

(*b*) The aversion from the idea that the laity, more especially in a country village, many of whom were 'ignorant' men, were fitted to engage in a discussion on religious theological and doctrinal matters.

(*c*) That it would lead to new ideas being promulgated, and to dangerous heresies arising.

(*d*) That the authority of the Church would be undermined.

The early days of the Church, before it became affected by dogmatic authorities, when the Christians met in each other's houses to talk over their beliefs — and of Christ who had so recently departed — may have been the age of heresies, but it was the great age of the Church, when the new bursting life was springing up from a fertile soil.

So it may be again, when clergy and laity meet together in brotherly discussion and argument.

The cry of those who stand afar off, outside the rigid pale of ecclesiasticism and 'Churchianity,' is not that of St. Peter in the Hall of Caiaphas — 'I know not the man'; but that of Mary at the empty tomb, 'They have taken away my Lord; I know not where they have laid Him.'

C. E. LART.

Harpford,
Devon.
January 5, 1942.